

JUN 29 2006

PATENT
Docket No.: D/A 1322 (1508/3380)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicants	:	P. Hamilton Clark et al.)	Examiner:
Serial No.	:	09/950,087)	Johnna R. Stimpak
Cnfrm. No.	:	2257)	Art Unit:
Filed	:	September 10, 2001)	3623
For	:	ELECTRONIC PROJECT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM USING PROJECT PHASES)	

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

MAIL STOP AF
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

In response to the April 19, 2006, final office action, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the claims.

In the final office action, the Examiner maintained the rejection of Claims 1-5, 7-11, 13-17, 19-21, 23-25 and 27-29 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), on the grounds that they were allegedly considered to be anticipated by the McAtee et al. patent (U.S. Patent No. 5,301,320). As set forth in MPEP § 2131, "to anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim." For reasons presented below, it is respectfully submitted that the McAtee et al. patent does not teach every element of the rejected claims, and therefore does not meet the standard of anticipation of those claims.

On pages 10-12 of the response filed on February 1, 2006, Applicants pointed out that the parts of the McAtee et al. patent relied upon in the November 4, 2005, action (i.e., column 5, lines 25-30 and column 7, lines 17-33) do not describe, either explicitly or inherently, claimed processes including "identifying which of one or more stored exit criteria are applicable to at least one of the phases of the project," as recited in independent claims 1,

OK to enter
JL
7-7-06